

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 17 and 19 remain. Claims 18 and 20 are cancelled without prejudice.

Drawings

The present Office Action objects to Figure 1 and directs a legend such as Prior Art be added. Applicants have amended Figure 1 in a concurrent drawing amendment response.

Claim Objections.

The present Office Action objects to Claims 17, 19 and 20 for informalities. Applicants have amended Claims 17 and 19 to include a period. Applicants have cancelled Claim 20.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chi (US 6,282,144). Applicants have reviewed the Chi reference and, for the following rationale, Applicants respectfully asserts that the present invention is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Chi reference.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Chi reference is not directed to the present invention as recited in Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 15-18. Specifically the present invention, as set forth in amended independent Claim 1 recites:

... a division point for dividing said signal into a plurality of output communication paths, wherein said plurality of output communication paths are substantially the same length, said division point coupled to said first resistor; ...

Applicants respectfully assert the Chi reference does not teach same length paths. To the extent the Chi reference may mention a canonical branch circuit [Figure 5 and Col 8 line 54], Applicants respectfully assert the Chi reference does not teach a plurality of output communication paths that are substantially the same length.

Similarly, newly amended Claim 8 references a termination stub system that includes a plurality of equal length branch signal communication paths. Again, Applicants respectfully assert the Chi reference does not teach a plurality of equal length branch signal communication paths.

Newly amended Claim 15 directs a signal along a plurality of communication paths that are substantially the same length. Again, Applicants respectfully assert the Chi reference does not teach a plurality of equal length branch signal communication paths.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert the Chi reference teaches away from the present claimed invention by indicating the Chi reference is directed to systems

with unequal signal path lengths [Col. 1, lines 23 to 24] and different distribution conductor lengths [Col. 3, lines 4 to 5].

Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent Claims 2-7, 9 – 14, 16 - 17 and 19 are allowable as depending from allowable independent Claims.

103 Rejections

In the present above referenced Office Action, Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chi in view of Sato (USPN 5,978,897). Applicants respectfully assert that the present claimed invention is neither shown nor suggested by the Chi and/or Sato references, alone or together in combination.

The present Office action acknowledges that the Chi reference does not teach the particular resistance means or that the resistance means is a trace resistance and the paths are traces in a circuit board. Applicants also respectfully assert the Chi reference does not teach a plurality of output communication paths that are substantially the same length. Applicants respectfully assert that the secondary Sato reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Chi reference. To the extent the Sato reference may mention a microstrip line [Col. 1, line 9], Applicants respectfully assert the Sato reference does not teach or mention trace lines in a printed circuit board. In addition, Applicants respectfully assert a person of ordinary skill in the art would not find a suggestion, motivation or teaching to combine the Chi teaching away reference with the Sato reference to teach a system or method as claimed in the present application.

In the present above referenced Office Action, Claims 8-12 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Buuck in view of Chi. Applicants respectfully assert that the present claimed invention is neither shown nor suggested by the Buuck, and/or Chi references, alone or together in combination.

The present Office action acknowledges that the Buuck reference does not teach a termination stub. In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that the Buuck reference teaches away from the present invention by indicating a terminator 50 [Figure 1] is removed from the system [Figure 2] when “electrically substantially equidistant” devices are included. Applicants respectfully assert that the secondary Chi reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Buuck reference. In addition, Applicants respectfully assert a person of ordinary skill in the art would not find a suggestion, motivation or teaching to combine the Buuck teaching away reference with the Chi teaching away reference to teach a system or method as claimed in the present application.

In the present above referenced Office Action, Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Buuck in view of Chi and further in view of Feraud et al. Applicants respectfully assert that the present claimed invention is neither shown nor suggested by the Buuck, Chi and/or Feraud et al. references, alone or together in combination.

The present Office action acknowledges that the Buuck and Chi references do not teach memory components/chips. Applicants respectfully assert that the secondary

Feraud et al. reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Buuck reference. To the extent the Feraud et al. reference may merely mention a memory [Col. 1 line14], Applicants respectfully assert the Feraud et al. reference does not teach receivers in an integrated circuit with a control signal that controls memory components. Applicants also respectfully assert that the mere mention of a memory does not teach control signals that are chip select signals. In addition, Applicants respectfully assert the Feraud et al. reference teaches away from the present invention by indicating transmission lines are unterminated [Col. 2 line 8]. Applicants respectfully assert a person of ordinary skill in the art would not find a suggestion, motivation or teaching to combine the Feraud teaching away reference with the Buck teaching away reference with the Chi teaching away reference to teach a system or method as claimed in the present application.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Date: 12/13 2004



John P. Wagner
Reg. No. 35,398
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060